REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner indicated on page 6 in the middle of the page as follows:

> The concept of "embedding" the die in the heat deformable material so that the top of the die is coplanar with the top of the substrate as intended by the specification is novel. But, the language used in the claims does not clearly and specifically teach away from the rejections cited above.
>
> While the examiner currently does not have a satisfactory suggestion for allowable language, I am certain that such language can be found.

The above-quoted remark was discussed by the undersigned and Richard Nathan with Examiner Zarneke on October 24, 2003. The undersigned proposed to amend Claim 1 by adding the language "wherein an opening in said substrate to hold said die is formed during embedding of said die in said substrate". The undersigned then stated that Claim 1 was believed to be allowable over the prior art of record in view of the amendment. The Examiner agreed to consider the amendment in view of the above-quoted remark. The undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that embedding of a die in a heat deformable material was the subject of another patent application 09/963,337 as identified at the bottom of page 5 of the current application. The undersigned also mentioned that this application had subsequently issued as US Patent 6,528,351. The undersigned then stated that since it appeared that the Examiner had not taken this document into account, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) will be filed to cite this document. The undersigned then requested the Examiner to be sure to take it into account in determining the patentability of the amended claims.

In addition, the undersigned also discussed with the Examiner a new claim that is responsive to the Examiner's citation of U.S. Patent 5,629,835 granted to Mahulikar. In particular, the undersigned pointed out that in the above-identified Office Action, at the bottom of page 2, the Examiner appeared to interpret the claim term "conductive path" broadly enough to cover not only traces 66 of Mahulikar but also the bondwire 58 of Mahulikar. To overcome this broad interpretation, the undersigned suggested that in the

SILICON VALLEY PATENT GROUP LLP
50 Mission College Blvd
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

new claim this term is to be replaced with a "trace of conductive material". The undersigned argued that the "trace of conductive material" is narrower than "conductive path" and excludes structures that use a bond wire. The undersigned further proposed to recite in the new claim that **each trace ends on the top surface of the substrate in a conductive land or pad, and is integrally formed on the substrate**. The Examiner said he will need to conduct a further search for this limitation, and that he may make an obviousness rejection. The undersigned submitted that the just-described limitations, in combination with the remaining limitations, were believed to put the new claim as a whole in form for allowance. The undersigned also submitted that since the field is crowded, even a small advance is worthy of patent protection. The Examiner agreed to take this into account in determining the patentability of the new claim.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8200, ext. 3.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the fax number 703-872-9318 on October 31, 2003.

S. Omkar — Oct 31, 2003
Attorney for Applicant(s) — Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

S. Omkar

Omkar K. Suryadevara
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,320

SILICON VALLEY PATENT GROUP LLP
50 Mission College Blvd
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210